

RECEIVED

SUNSHINE PERIOD

JUN 17 2003

From: RICHARD SCHAUSEIL
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:45 PM
Subject: DIVEST NOT CONSOLIDATE; YOU WORK FOR US THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, NOT THEM

TO THE FCC:

DO NOT ALLOW THE FURTHER CONSOLIDATION OF OUR MEDIA:

THE POINTS ARE REAL SIMPLE AND I AM SURPRISED YOU HAVEN'T FIGURED THIS OUT ON YOUR OWN.

1. THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY IS A CLOSED INDUSTRY
 - a. ITS WHO YOU KNOW
2. THE MEDIA IS ALREADY CONTROLLED BY CORPORATE AMERICA WHICH TRADES FAVORS ALL THE TIME WITH THE SITTING POLITICIANS
 - a. YOU CANNOT HAVE HONEST HARD HITTING REPORTING IN THIS COUNTRY ANY MORE
 - b. OUR PRESS IS RIDICULED BY THE REST OF THE WORLD BECAUSE WE ARE A COUNTRY SELF-PROMOTED AS THE SAFEST HAVEN FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND WE HAVE THE NEWS NETWORKS AND MEDIA GIANTS CENSORING THEIR OWN REPORTERS AND ANALYSTS
 - c. THE PRESS IS SUPPOSE TO BE THE WATCHDOG OF OUR FREE SOCIETY
 - d. WHOEVER CONTROLS THE PRESS CONTROLS SOCIETY
3. OUR CONGRESS AND REPRESENTATIVE FORM OF DEMOCRACY HAS ALREADY BEEN HIJACKED BY CORPORATE AMERICA AND THEY DIDN'T DO IT WITH BOX CUTTERS: THEY DID WITH GOOD 'OL AMERICAN CASH.

THIS IS SO SIMPLE IF YOU CAN'T SEE IT THEN WE NEED TO EXAMINE YOUR BACKGROUNDS AND WATCH YOUR FUTURES BECAUSE THE AMOUNT OF POWER AND WEALTH THESE MEDIA GIANTS HAVE, MAY BE DISTRACTING Y'ALL FROM DOING YOUR JOBS.

YOU SHOULD BE DIVESTING AND DILUTING THE POWER NOT THE OPPOSITE, BY CONSOLIDATING AND CONCENTRATING.

SINCERELY, DO THE RIGHT THING,

RICHARD SCHASUEIL
1-888-210-3730

From: John Sunderman
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:30 PM
Subject: what do we do now?

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

02-277

If the FCC had come to today's decision by honest means, I would be upset but willing to deal with it. As it is, Mr. Powell and his cronies have defied the will of the people and hijacked democracy. What's next?

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: Van Antwerp, Beth (US - Los Angeles)
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:31 PM
Subject: FCC's Agenda

Chairman Powell:

From all I am able to determine, you are following an agenda based on a personal ideology, and ignoring the will of the American people with regard to the de-regulation of media ownership. You have to know that what you are doing is wrong. There has not been a single instance of de-regulation that has worked to the benefit of the consumer. Another way of saying that is that no group seems to be capable of self-regulation because self-interest always holds sway.

Those who abuse the privileges of their position ultimately go down in infamy.

SUNSHINE PERIOD

Beth Van Antwerp
P.O. Box 7750
Los Angeles CA 90007

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message. Any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited.

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

From: Linnea S. Martin
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:35 PM
Subject: Re: vote to preserve localism, program diversity, and competition in the Television Broadcast Act of

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of Secretary

Thank you for your message.

SUNSHINE PERIOD

My concern is the quality and variety of news and entertainment Americans access. Both are critical to a healthy democracy. Public television, which as you know is no longer well-funded by the federal or state governments, has assumed the lion's share of responsibility in providing quality programming in the United States. I am embarrassed to think what people in other countries think of us on the basis of what our media says about us, our priorities, and our concerns. Cable news is not worth \$500 a year for basic service. We need to re-think what is involved in providing Americans with well-rounded news coverage that is motivated by what the public needs to know and needs to grow -- not how much money programming will generate for media owners. We need a cable environment which is good, diverse, and challenges the best, most creative, providers. Technology has never been better. Quality of programming has never been worse.

At 10:41 AM 6/2/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know
 >that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you
 >will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and
 >thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important
 >not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from
 >the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our
 >country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with
 >your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks
 >for getting in touch.

JUN 17 2003

From: Brad Penner
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:54 PM
Subject: RE. Common Man

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
SUNSHINE PERIOD

Well I see and hear that your group has decided to let the media monster grow even bigger. Some of you did a fine job of setting the foundation stones for killing any other possible broadcasted opinions.

Is your group so limited to not consider the possibilities of a huge one minded thought steering committee coupled with the newly BPCR that our politicians passed? Maybe you did, but thought protecting the elected was better. Basically your group has further solidified the election process will be determined by the media.

I hope your proud, because it just adds another chapter to how the gov protects itself. It sure would be nice to be able to vote for or against the employment of all gov employees. But then again, the gov has protected itself wonderfully. Makes me ill...

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Brad Penner

> Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2003 10:29 AM

> To: 'mpowell@fcc.gov'; 'kabernat@fcc.gov'; 'mcopps@fcc.gov'; 'kjmweb@fcc.gov'; 'jadelste@fcc.gov'

> Subject: Common Man

>

> I am just a common man in this wonderful country of ours. But I understand that not all people want to be common. Some want serious control of others.

>

> With out your protection and scrutiny, our media would become so biased to what the select group of owners deem correct for us to see, hear, read that the loss of true knowledge would be unbelievable.

>

> For example, the Arab television and radio. They only broadcast what they want you to believe. Doesn't matter if it is true. Quite concerning to me is such activity. And without your help to maintain no media monopolies, this thought steering activity will become acceptable for our media.

>

> Please, do not relax any broadcast ownership rules. They get by with too much as it is.

>

> Many years ago a founding father of our great nation stated that the First Amendment does not protect the spreading of untruths and lies through the press. Consider that for one moment. These guys were light years ahead of the politicians we now have. If we relax our rules to allow even more biased reporting thru a single minded controlled media, it's basically another step towards a media run dictatorship of the USA.

>

> Please, I prefer to remain a voice, albeit a small common man's voice, but a voice it is. Taking the right away is just another small reduction of individual liberties to silence the masses.

>

> Brad Penner

> Mesquite, TX.

From: Melissa Metzler
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:00 PM
Subject: Do not change regulations

RECEIVED
JUN 17 2003
SUNSHINE PERIOD
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
JUN 17 2003

Mr. Copps,

Please do not relax the FCC regulations on media ownership.

Melissa S Metzler
821 N Winchester
Chicago, IL 60622

From: Steven McBride
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:04 PM
Subject: Thank You

SUNSHINE PERIOD
RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

Federal Sunlight Act of 1996
Office of Open Government

Mr. Copps,

Thank you for your vote this morning. Your statement about this issue was right on!

I hope that Congress weighs in and reverses this disaster.

I appreciate your defense of Democracy!

Steven McBride/Tennessee

From: rmcelroy
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 2:24 PM
Subject: Thanks...

RECEIVED
SUNSHINE PERIOD JUN 17 2003

for your effort to date regarding today's rule change. Im sure there are challenges ahead and it is good to know that there is someone on the commission who is politically and philosophically in line with the principals of democracy and the resources critical to protecting them.

My only hope is that the market is not so controlled that alternative news and entertainment sources will be blocked from meeting the demand of Americans who want their airways put to better use.

Thanks for the good fight,
Robert H. McElroy

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: Günther R.
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:16 PM
Subject: Another defeat for democracy in the U.S.

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

Dear Gentlemen:
Dear Ms. Abernathy:

Federal Election Commission
Chief of Secretary

Although I am not surprised about the direction each of you chose in today's vote on media ownership I am deeply disappointed that the Republican members of this commission have so little sense about what furthers and what hurts democracy. We anticipated all along how your vote will look like after you clearly conveyed to us that you do not care about how we feel about this very important issue; otherwise you had joined Commissioner Copps and Adelstein and stood answer to our many and worried questions at the hearings. The decision today is a defeat for democracy.

I promise we will make every effort to get this autocratic, utterly corrupt administration out of office in 2004 and with it, three of you.

Thank you, Commissioners Copps and Adelstein, for your vote of opposition to this irresponsible piece of regulation.

Sincerely,

Günther Ruckl, MD, PhD
1787 Council Bluff Dr.
Atlanta, Georgia 30345
404-634-7143

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: leslie gannon
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 3:22 PM
Subject: extend current hearings

Preliminary hearings should be extended. Why spend a great deal of tax money to defend against legal suits expected to arise out of the policies of the present FCC Commission when extended public hearings can clarify the parameters of FCC policy and how the people feel about it? How does the FCC define its responsibilities to a diverse public?

RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

I would like to know the following:

Is the FCC responsible for standards in programming?

Is the FCC responsible to insure not only national and local variety, but must the FCC insure diverse opinion itself in a meaningful way?

Is the FCC obliged to create equal opportunity, i.e., is it obligated to support free expression of opinion which, in fact, opposes an administration's policy? Would this not be a requisite of Free Speech under the First Amendment? How would this be done and when?

or

Is the FCC simply concerned with commercial issues?

How can a Federal Commission dedicated to the public air waves simply confine itself to issues of economic feasibility, for example, the notion of competition without examining what competition truly means from a legal standpoint? Many corporations have entities or associations which outwardly appear separate, but, functionally or even legally, are not separate, especially from influential public servants.

How would 'competition' be assured without a thorough investigation and some sort of written declaration made by corporations agreeing to penalty under law for practices of secrecy and/or exploitation of broadcasting rights granted by the public? Define "exploitation."

What are the limitation rights of free speech for corporations? Are you willing to define and set such limitations at this time?

Is the FCC willing to provide free broadcasting on an equal time basis for political candidates who disagree with a President on political policy even though they have been appointed by that President? Realistically, can only wealthy persons - persons who can "buy time" on public airwaves run for office? What is the responsibility of the FCC in this regard? This is a very important issue because if money defines the abridgment of free speech, then the FCC, being a Federal agency, most probably has some Constitutional requirements to meet

Would the FCC create a "free speech channel" on television and radio dedicated full time in every community for the purpose of presenting open challenges to current public policy? Or would the government create a national free newspaper, for instance, called "Dissent"? In other words, can opponents of an administration (any administration) have Equal, free time to present their case so that the public may be duly informed? Would this not be protecting the vote, and would this not be an obligation of the FCC in so

SUNSHINE PERIOD

far as the vote is connected to public information? What is the connection between the vote and information? So far, I am not aware of anything in FCC public statements which addresses the relation between protecting the vote via protecting information, public obligation. I would put protection of the vote pretty high on the responsibilities of the FCC.

Privilege has direct relations to responsibility. Let us speak less about profit and gain, and more about obligations to the peoples of this country.

Leslie Gannon, Victor, MT

CC: max@senate.gov, washington.journal@c-span.org

From: David Kezell
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Jun 13, 2003 1:46 AM
Subject: Please Do Not Relax Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Commissioners,
Please do not relax existing broadcast ownership rules. Much of domestic media is already monopolized and one-sided. Allowing further domination by the few will erode our rights of free speech. Thank you for your condieration

David Kezell
2515 Cambridge Dr
Antioch, CA 94509

MSN 8 helps eliminate e-mail viruses. Get 2 months FREE*.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/virus>

From: Richard Wagenblast
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 3:37 PM
Subject: Re: FCC's Easing of Media Ownership Restrictions

Dear Commissioners Copps and Adelstein,

I applaude both of you fine gentlemen, and you should be proud for the stands you have taken.

I regret that the nicely worded e-mail that I sent to Chairman Powell on May 21 on this issue fell on deaf ears. I should have copied both of you so that it would have been counted among the opposed majority.

Still, while it is unbelievable that this action was taken and that common courtesies were not extended to you or the public that urged caution before revising these rules, I am very grateful that the two of you came out so strongly against these revisions (or at least in favor of strict scrutiny and full disclosure of what was proposed). I read both of your dissenting statements, and took great solace in your words and the fact that each statement was written so eloquently and forcefully. I am quite certain that the groundswell of public opinion against these new relaxations and the awful public policy that they represent, along with your willingness to speak out so strongly against them, will be instrumental in having them scrapped in future court challenges.

I again thank-you for standing with the overwhelming majority of the American people, and look forward to a return of the days when the FCC was a respected agency (both from a policy and enforcement view) which vigorously defended the public interest rather than the interests of a few giant corporations. I am a dual license holder since the 1970's, and remember well when the FCC was taken far more seriously than it is today, and I believe that if there were more like you serving on the Commission, it would still be true today. Hopefully, with the courage of future Commissioners like yourselves, it can again be true someday.

Richard Wagenblast
3 Stowe Lane
Howell, NJ 07731

General Radiotelephone License holder
and Advanced Class Amateur Operator
and Former Radio Afficionado (prior to 1996!)

From: Elizabeth
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 2:38 PM
Subject: THANKS FOR YOUR EFFORT

We watched the Commerce Committee today on C-Span and wish to commend both of you on your valiant efforts to express the views of a concerned majority. I shall communicate with our representatives in Congress in the hopes that better rulings can be made to protect Vox Populi from the groups represented in those 34 meetings with the lobbyist. Sen. Boxer really did a number on Ms Abernathy, didn't she!

Thanks for what you tried to do for us...we'll pick it up and run with it as long as we can. Keep the faith!

From: Bill Colohan
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 1:17 PM
Subject: wrong decision

Your decision to allow further consolidation is wrong and plays into the hands of the largest entities. All of you sold out

Thanks....Bill

Bill Colohan
IT Interface
(513)961-2252
(513)961-9552 fax
bcolohan@itinterface.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Ron Miller
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 12:27 PM
Subject: Thank You

Commissioner Copps,

I would like to express my thanks to you for taking a stand against the recent FCC rule changes on media ownership/concentration.

I was frankly astonished that Chairman Powell's comments today in the Congressional hearing. One interesting comment he made was about the fact that the fairness and community interest mandates related to open air broadcasting do not apply to cable and other subscription services such as satellite. That he is arrogant enough to bring this up speaks volumes about his attitude and agenda. I am sure that he is confident that there is little chance that the Congress will realize and act upon the fact that technology has distorted the original intent of some of our basic laws and regulations, and that what is really needed is the building of a new regulatory environment which promotes innovation while protecting the community interest.

What is communication in a free, modern society? Our founding fathers of course never envisioned how radio would alter the world. Nor, I believe, did the founders of the FCC and its initial regulators foresee the impact of the ability to confine open air `communications' signals to privately owned `closed networks' of cable and fiber, other than the limited voices of telegraphy and the telephone. In the public interest, we as a society should be striving to provide platforms of communications which raise the level of discourse throughout society, not some distorted, private oligarchy which promotes Lowest Common Denominator programming while maximizing advertising revenue

Too many people assume the opposite of the one voice of a closed, dictatorial society, is an infinite number of watered down voices, an infinite number of marketing messages skewed toward the bottom line. This was not the objective of the founding fathers in establishing our representative democracy. The aim of an open, rational market in a free society ought not to be the inevitable consolidation of power and standardization of content. This is the road we are on today, bowing to the twin idols of unbridled Globalization and Greed.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of the public.

Ron Miller

San Diego

From: Ron Miller
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 12:23 PM
Subject: Thank You

Commissioner Copps,

I would like to express my thanks to you for taking a stand against the recent FCC rule changes on media ownership/concentration.

I was frankly astonished that Chairman Powell's comments today in the Congressional hearing. One interesting comment he made was about the fact that the fairness and community interest mandates related to open air broadcasting do not apply to cable and other subscription services such as satellite. That he is arrogant enough to bring this up speaks volumes about his attitude and agenda. I am sure that he is confident that there is little chance that the Congress will realize and act upon the fact that technology has distorted the original intent of some of our basic laws and regulations, and that what is really needed is the building of a new regulatory environment which promotes innovation while protecting the community interest.

What is communication in a free, modern society? Our founding fathers of course never envisioned how radio would alter the world. Nor, I believe, did the founders of the FCC and its initial regulators foresee the impact of the ability to confine open air 'communications' signals to privately owned 'closed networks' of cable and fiber, other than the limited voices of telegraphy and the telephone. In the public interest, we as a society should be striving to provide platforms of communications which raise the level of discourse throughout society, not some distorted, private oligarchy which promotes Lowest Common Denominator programming while maximizing advertising revenue

Too many people assume the opposite of the one voice of a closed, dictatorial society, is an infinite number of watered down voices, an infinite number of marketing messages skewed toward the bottom line. This was not the objective of the founding fathers in establishing our representative democracy. The aim of an open, rational market in a free society ought not to be the inevitable consolidation of power and standardization of content. This is the road we are on today, bowing to the twin idols of unbridled Globalization and Greed.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of the American public.

Ron Miller

San Diego

From: Heather Brown
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 12:13 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Michael,

I'm concerned about the proposed new regulations regarding the number of TV stations one company can own. I feel this would be detrimental to the quality of news and programming put out, leading to a "monocrop" of news programs. We need a variety of voices available to us. One corporation, owning many stations does not lead to diversity. Please vote no!

Thanks,

Heather Brown
Biologist
Mad River Biologists
1497 Central Ave.
McKinleyville, CA 95519
heather@madrivernbio.com
(707)839-0900

From: runswscissorz
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 6:33 AM
Subject: Re: public input

Thank you for your efforts regarding the media consolidation vote. There are many of us out here that won't forget the effort you put forth on our behalf to bring this issue to a public discussion. I contacted my Senators prior to, and have contacted my Senators and Representatives since the vote. I have little hope that the House will address it, but I understand the Senate has become interested in the result. Can you recommend any other avenue I might pursue as a registered voter, citizen, and consumer?

-Jason Callahan

----- Original Message -----

From: Michael Copps <MCOPPS@fcc.gov>
To: <runswscissorz@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 6:12 PM
Subject: Re: public input

Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks for getting in touch.

>>> runswscissorz 05/04/03 11:36AM >>>

I recently viewed your interview on Bill Moyer's show, and I found myself in full agreement with your opinion that the issues of media ownership require serious public consideration. I personally remain unconvinced that the removal of regulation on objects of public domain results in any gain whatsoever for the public at large, the consumers of said objects, or anyone outside of a group of relatively affluent individuals. In fact, I believe that history has demonstrated a direct correlation between deregulation and cost increases with reduced services.

I also feel that this particular issue has the effect of changing the fundamental role of the news media in our democracy by changing its basic motivation from one of informing for the public interest to one of informing for the corporate interest. This is a massive change to the one non-governmental check and balance available to a true democracy. As such, it needs to be addressed in a public manner, and not as some back room vote.

I intend to copy this letter to both of my Senators (FL). Thank you for your time, and I hope that you are able to press the FCC to examine this issue in a legitimate public forum.

-Jason Callahan

From: J E Herbert
To: Michael Copps
Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2003 1:45 AM
Subject: Re Broadcast Media Ownership Rules (Kindly share this with your fellow commissioners.)

Sir:

I was neither surprised or shocked by the commissions' vote on the 2nd, just saddened.

This is an example of why the a growing minority of our citizens are loosing faith in our democratic republic. It is one reason why people don't take time to vote

Day after day politicians, both state and federal, as well as various appointees seek to feather their nests or guarantee their positions by currying favour with persons and corporations of wealth and power, without regard to the needs of either our nation or the common man. Without in the current instance, considering that information will now be disseminated to the public if it meets the needs and has the approval of hypocrites like Sumner Redstone or Ted Turner. By the commission's vote, freedom has been weakened and the First Amendment's power diluted.

Now, we will have to spend the money to fight each and every buy-out or merger in court or before the SEC hoping that they will have the guts to do what the commission did not.

I know Mr. Copp, in you, I'm preaching to the choir, but on June 2nd 2003, the free and independent media, essential to the maintenance of freedom, ceased to exist.

J Edwin Herbert

----- Original Message -----

From: "Michael Copps" <MCOPPS@fcc.gov>

To: <sfdi00@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2003 2:02 AM

Subject: Re: Broadcast Media Ownership Rules (Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation.)

Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know

that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important

not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our

country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks

for getting in touch.

From: Aaron Shaw
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Jun 6, 2003 5:25 PM
Subject: FCC Regulations

It is painfully clear that the FCC has been hijacked by special interests. Proof- the seventy closed door meetings with private industry leaders and only one public hearing leading up to their decision to relax media ownership rules. At what point did Capitalism become more powerful than Democracy? Some countries have dictators that exploit the people but in America the people are exploited by their own companies. Hats off to the FCC for helping destroy what little faith the American people have left for regulating commissions. I challenge you to justify your actions!

Concerned Citizen

From: Ross, Rob
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Jun 6, 2003 10:08 AM
Subject: some encouragement

Dear Commissioners Adelstein and Copps ,

Thank you for standing up to the corporations, Chairman Powell, and the remaining commissioners stating the case for the real owners of the airwaves. I suppose in some respects it is the public's own fault for being complacent absentee owners of the media, until now, and allowing giant corporations free reign to shamelessly make enormous profits off 'our' property. However, in earlier times, the media was more responsible as the Fourth Estate - it was not merely a mouthpiece for government and industry, not to mention fewer clear conflicts of interest, once upon a time. These days, especially under the current administration and after 9-11, the media has become a tool to "manufacture consent" (Chomsky) and create a "Rich Media, Poor Democracy" (McChesney). Has "1984" (Orwell) finally arrived ? Your votes are at least some encouragement that we haven't stooped to that level...yet. One fear is that the next step could be censorship of community media and/or the dismantling of public networks such as Pacifica Radio by large corporations (which nearly happened two years ago, but stopped by overwhelming community concern and action). We can only hope that concerned, intelligent people such as yourselves, will be able to reverse the trend of the FCC to give away and/or sell our property (and our Democracy) to the highest bidder.

Sincerely

Rob Ross

151 Milltown Road
Holmes, NY 12531
&
WCC-TV
Westchester Community College
75 Grasslands Road
Valhalla, NY 10595
rob.ross@sunywcc.edu

Cc. Congresswoman Sue Kelly
Senator Hilary R. Clinton
Senator Charles Schumer

CC: Mike Powell

From: Julie Jacobus
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Jun 6, 2003 7:19 AM
Subject: FCC belongs to the people not the corps

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: Jeremy Smith
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Jun 6, 2003 12:22 AM
Subject: Thank you for your integrity

I just wanted to send a note of encouragement in your stand against these rule changes. It's good to know that at least all five members of the commission weren't bought off by the giant media moguls. It is more important now, however, to make sure the outpouring of the American people who disagree with this know that Congress can soften this blow. That is the beauty of checks and balances -- hopefully they will see how dangerous this is.

Please continue to inform the American people this fight is not over yet. And let them know that although this panel (you and Mr. Adelstein notwithstanding) feels they can ignore what the American people want, Congress is not as easily able to brush off the voice of the people. Thank you for standing up for what you believe is right. Please put me on any sort of mailing list you or the FCC may have regarding these rules.
Thank You,

Jeremy Smith
431 Willowbank St.
Apt. 202
Bellefonte, PA 16823

From: Katherine Rykowski
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:35 PM
Subject: FCC and My Best Interests

Katherine Rykowski
918 Havenhurst #203
Los Angeles, CA 90046

June 6, 2003

Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Copps:

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is considering possible changes to its media ownership rules. I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Allowing greater concentration and cross-ownership of media may have a profound impact on Americans' access to a wide range of news, information, programming and political commentary. To have a healthy democratic dialogue and participation on major issues, I believe it is important that we have access to a diversity of opinions and information, not a handful of options. Altering media ownership rules could seriously affect vigorous public debate and the marketplace of ideas. Rulemaking of this significance should therefore be open to public comment.

I also believe that, to stay democratic and free, we need to ensure diversity of opinion and the free exchange of ideas. It is imperative that there be the widest possible comment on any proposed rule so the Commission may fairly and impartially evaluate whether it will promote or hinder such diversity.

Once again, I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Sincerely,

Katherine Rykowski

From: Rex Robards
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, Jun 7, 2003 4:16 PM
Subject: Re: Media Mergers

Dear Mr. Copps,
Even though I am disappointed in the FCC's decision to further deregulate broadcast media, I want to thank you for your efforts on my behalf as an American citizen. I have consoled myself with the thought that there is at least one representative of the public interest at the FCC.

Thank you,
Rex Robards

----- Original Message -----

From: "Michael Copps" <MCOPPS@fcc.gov>
To: <rex@rexrobards.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2003 1:19 PM
Subject: Re: Oppose Media Mergers (Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation)

Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks for getting in touch.

From: michael marty
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 8, 2003 6:25 PM
Subject: The airwaves belong to the public, not Rupert Murdoch

michael marty
120 garfield ave
mingo junction, OHIO 43938

June 7, 2003

Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Copps:

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is considering possible changes to its media ownership rules. I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Allowing greater concentration and cross-ownership of media may have a profound impact on Americans' access to a wide range of news, information, programming and political commentary. To have a healthy democratic dialogue and participation on major issues, I believe it is important that we have access to a diversity of opinions and information, not a handful of options. Altering media ownership rules could seriously affect vigorous public debate and the marketplace of ideas. Rulemaking of this significance should therefore be open to public comment.

I also believe that, to stay democratic and free, we need to ensure diversity of opinion and the free exchange of ideas. It is imperative that there be the widest possible comment on any proposed rule so the Commission may fairly and impartially evaluate whether it will promote or hinder such diversity.

Once again, I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Sincerely,

michael marty

From: Will Roemermann
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 8, 2003 2:33 PM
Subject: Bad Decision

I would suggest that you reverse your recent ruling that degrades the free communications market and put power into the hands of very few. Please do not cloud this issue; I realize that money rules, but please allow the people of these United States the freedoms guaranteed to us by the Constitution.

Will Roemermann

Will@ToneAmps.com

From: Christina Barnes
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sun, Jun 8, 2003 7:03 AM
Subject: Keep our airwaves free!

Christina Barnes
9755 Q Street, PMB 119
Omaha, NE 68127

June 6, 2003

Commissioner Michael Copps
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Copps.

It is my understanding that the Federal Communications Commission is considering possible changes to its media ownership rules. I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment

Allowing greater concentration and cross-ownership of media may have a profound impact on Americans' access to a wide range of news, information, programming and political commentary. To have a healthy democratic dialogue and participation on major issues, I believe it is important that we have access to a diversity of opinions and information, not a handful of options. Altering media ownership rules could seriously affect vigorous public debate and the marketplace of ideas. Rulemaking of this significance should therefore be open to public comment.

I also believe that, to stay democratic and free, we need to ensure diversity of opinion and the free exchange of ideas. It is imperative that there be the widest possible comment on any proposed rule so the Commission may fairly and impartially evaluate whether it will promote or hinder such diversity.

Once again, I urge you to fully disclose your ideas on this extremely important issue and allow hearings and public comment.

Sincerely,

Christina K Barnes

From: MICHAEL CIHA
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 8, 2003 1:16 AM
Subject: FCC Decision to Deregulate TV and Radio

Your decision on Monday to give monopoly control to mega-media corporations, ignoring the wishes of the public, whose interests YOU are supposed to serve and protect was a BAD idea.

With this decision you are giving even greater control of TV and radio to a handful of mega-corporations. The FCC has opened a Pandora's Box of indecency and violence on the airwaves. The airwaves are already overflowing with distasteful and raunchy programming made by New York based mega-corporations who have no understanding or interest in community standards. You just voted to make it even worse.

There are a multitude of public policy organizations from all ideological origins who are in universal agreement that this is a bad idea. Why are their concerns ignored? Instead Chairman Powell and his colleagues stood together against the American people.

This is indeed a sad day. A day when appointed federal officials, placed on this commission to represent the needs, concerns, and wishes of the American people, turn a deaf ear to their constituents and blatantly indulge a few rich TV overlords who only desire to further dominate the TV industry and make as much money as they can no matter who they squash in the process.

Every day I find another reason to turn OFF the TV. You've just made it where I may be selling it instead.

- Michael J Ciha
70 Augusta Ct
North Liberty, IA 52317
cihapet@reborn.com